



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_63233
Title of the Manuscript:	STRENGTHENING THE MONITORING AND SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM FOR BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS IN POST MORTEM MATERIAL FROM SLAUGHTERED CATTLE IN ESWATINI.
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>All underlined text plz. Verify again Plz. Check the year of data (i.e 2013-2018 or 2014-2018) because your data of table representing 2013-18, but in text somewhere you written 2014-2018 which are underlined .</p> <p>In Result section: Table 1:a. Plz. Check totalling of Slaughtered and passed , which are underlined. b. Proportion should not be total and 2018 data proportion are also wrong. c. Plz. Verify about percent of passed and condemned , your data indicating 98.84% passes and 1.16% condemned, however you mentioned 98.6% and 1.6% ?.</p> <p>In Fig. 2 & 3 caption: plz. Verify year of data which are underlined</p> <p>In Table 3: plz..verify total no. Of inspected carcass, already underlined</p> <p>In Table 4: Plz. Verify the underlined digits,</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Table 3: you should be written full-form of SNL and TDL in bracket, because in running text nowhere used</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>In discussion section: I think the underlined sentence (The results confirmatory tests.) may be not necessary.</p> <p>Under discussion: Plz. Verify the data of false positive i.e 98.15%, which are underlined</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ranjan Kumar
Department, University & Country	Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, India